

CITY OF BRAWLEY
October 4, 2011

The City Council of the City of Brawley, California met in a Regular Meeting at 6:00 PM, Council Chambers, 383 Main Street, Brawley, California, the date, time and place duly established for the holding of said meeting. The City Clerk attests to the posting of the agenda pursuant to G.C. §54954.2.

The meeting was called to order by *Mayor Campbell* @ 6:00 PM

The invocation was offered by *Pastor Ted Koroluk, Western Avenue Baptist Church*

The pledge of allegiance to our flag was led by *CM Kelley*

PRESENT: Campbell, Couchman, Kelley, Miranda, Nava

ABSENT: None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was *approved* as amended. m/s/c Nava/Kelley 5-0

Item 3 (d) Approve participation in ICTC consolidated Dial A Ride SOQ/RFP Process and Authorization of the City Manager or her designee to execute all documents in relation to the program *the item was moved from the Consent Agenda to Regular Business for discussion and approval.*

AYES: Campbell, Couchman, Kelley, Miranda, Nava

NAYES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

1. PUBLIC APPEARANCES/COMMENTS

Mayor Campbell introduced Esmeralda Diaz and her daughter Adrianna. Ms. Diaz said she was trying to put together a fundraiser to raise money for her daughter's medical expenses and medical bills that the insurance won't pay. Please join us for the fundraiser which will take place on October 15th starting at 12:00 Noon at the Hidalgo Hall in which we will be selling Barbecue plates and have entertainment.

Mayor Campbell said that Pete Leon approached them at the Chamber Mixer and a lot of us were really touched. I think it showed the family the spirit of our community when someone needs help that we try to step in and try to take care of that. A special thanks to Mr. Brian Webb from National Beef for what you've done and the family knows it.

Mr. Leon stated he wanted to thank Mr. Webb and everyone that has donated and invited everyone to the festivities and please come support us.

2. DEPARTMENT REPORTS

a. VEHICLE ABATEMENT PROGRAM – FRANCISCO SOTO, BUILDING OFFICIAL.

Staff Report - Francisco Soto, Building Official

On September 6, 2011 during the Council Member Reports the proper notification process was questioned and an explanation was required in addition to other items that were discussed during that portion of the council meeting. The notification process for the particular site that was discussed basically consisted of a regular letter dated and mailed on June 22nd; a second letter was sent certified on July 19th. The post office posted a request to have that letter picked up on July 20th and then again on August 12th. The 3 day notice was posted after no response to those other 3 misses on August 31st. That pretty much represents the standard operating procedure for notification on abandoned vehicles. We don't just leave a 3 day notice. We want to clarify the process and verify as we said we would on September 6th exactly what occurred at that site.

Another item that was discussed was exemptions for cars that were in a state of disrepair. I need to notify you that the ordinance does not allow any exemptions except for a car that is inoperable or un-registered within an enclosed building. The age of the car is not contained in the ordinance as an exemption. There was also discussion regarding possibly changing the ordinance to having a car in disrepair that is not visible in the rear yard. Regarding the notification procedure and how we handle these items: the fire insurance exchange phone number is on the notice. However, it also refers to the City Clerk in various locations on the notice. The City Clerk has referred many of these clients over to us. Whenever we can make an arrangement for the owner to pull the car, whether it meets our ordinance requirements or not, we have a history of allowing that. We have taken 3-4 months to remove cars as long as the owner gives us a reasonable explanation or shows progress. We have had an owner with 3 abandoned cars and none of them were his. They were from relatives and in fact within 3 months he had them removed. If contacted, we can take you away from the notification process and you will not get a 3 day notice. If they contact staff and their answer is I can possibly move the car and comply with the ordinance, adjustments can be made. The reason that we're here is to explain the ordinance as it is right now being enforced by a contractor. The contractor is hired by Joint Powers which we are part of. The funding for the enforcement is mostly out of DMV funds that are under the control of Joint Powers and the ordinance was passed in this manner to match the other entities within the ordinance. This way the contractor wouldn't have to remember which ordinance he was basically enforcing. Basically you are up-to-date on how we handle these procedures and also request your direction on what you want to do with the ordinance.

CM Miranda said that approximately a year ago or so when we passed this resolution; I personally had a question on some of the antiques or classic cars. According to **Code Enforcement Officer, Rick Breland** any car that is 25 years or older will be considered a classic which would be about a 1986 or older. At that time, if I'm not mistaken, it was said that applicable vehicles are ones that were able to be seen from the public view. It was asked if it was from the street and I believe it was said yes. The concern I have is the contractor is cruising down the alleys and writing down or ticketing vehicles that are being parked. I understand it's an eyesore. But some of these vehicles that have been affected are classic cars from the 40s, 50s

and so on. I don't know if we can particularly change that resolution or not because there's some confusion going on with the community as far as what is classified as an abandoned vehicle: a vehicle that is a hobby to many.

BO Soto mentioned that the ordinance itself exempts no cars except one within an enclosed building. That's the way the ordinance is written. That's why I'm reporting back to you and asking for your direction in this matter.

Mayor Campbell stated that he thinks that this is something that we need to focus on. I think if a person has a car in the backyard, away from the public and they work on it and it is secured, I can't see that being a problem. To say that it needs to be in a covered area creates an issue for some folks. If it's in a fenced backyard where it's not a nuisance; I think we should probably take a look at that ordinance.

CM Couchman asked if the contract that we have is part of the Joint Powers Insurance Agreement and how long does that contract have to run? And when does it expire? **Answer:** I don't know the answer to that question but I can look it up. (**Soto**).

CM Couchman said his understanding is that one of the entities has opted out because of some of the issues they ran into with the company or issues with cars.

BO Soto asked if you are talking about the abandoned vehicle ordinance or talking about the vacant building lot ordinance. **Answer:** I'm talking about vehicle abatement ordinance specifically and I don't know if that's true but that's what I heard because of some of the feedback that the City received about the aggressiveness of the company. I don't know if that's an issue or not. My personal observation on all this is that we continue to get complaints about this from a variety of people. I always feel that a man or woman's home is their castle and if it's in the backyard and it's covered and no one can see it, I don't want to interfere with that. I think you're asking for problems. If it's in the front yard and clearly a nuisance on the street or parked on a public street, then I can see an issue with that. One or two cars in the backyard, I'm not sure I feel comfortable with going and telling people they cannot do that. I understand that there are some problems with that, especially if it's behind a fence where no one can see in but the person enforcing. Plus, the enforcer may jump up to see over the fence and sees the car, then that to me is a problem. So I'm in favor of looking into the ordinance and making some adjustments. I don't think we need to make it totally go away but it has posed some problems with our residents. (**Couchman**)

CM Kelley asked if this company was from San Diego? **Answer:** Out of the Coachella Valley area, I think. (**Soto**)

CM Kelley asked do you get notified when they are coming into town? **Answer:** No, it's an on-going process and they're probably here 2-3 days a week. (**Soto**)

CM Kelley stated that under the JPIA we have to conform to a uniform standard across? **Answer:** that was the intent of the ordinance. Now we have asked what would happen if we made changes such as the one exactly discussed by both **CM Miranda** and **CM Couchman**. They had a little

heartburn with that but they didn't tell us they weren't going to enforce it. I expect they are going to want to maybe add some costs for other items and I don't know what the JPIA will say about changing the ordinance because we report at quarterly meetings. We haven't had a meeting since this discussion. It is my intent to report to you on exactly what would happen as far as enforcement at this point. The current cost for enforcing the ordinance is small to the City but if we have to shoulder it, it will be a much greater cost. The noticing and towing plus staff time will be quite costly. That is why we passed the ordinance in the first place. It was top heavy with requirements. We need direction from council and we'll do what you like with the ordinance and report back to you with whatever changes you ask. *(Soto)*

CM Couchman asked how many JPIA signatures are there and how many cities? **Answer:** I think there are 5 signatures: County of Imperial, Brawley, El Centro, Imperial and Calexico. *(Soto)*

CA Morita stated that the City of Imperial did not choose to participate for some of the reasons that you just talked about.

CM Couchman asked if they are not part of the JPIA? **Answer:** That's correct. *(Morita)*

CM Couchman said his understanding is that the City of El Centro was not but not sure of it. El Centro had been a part of it but then they opted out because they had some problems with the enforcement, etc... but I don't know if that's true or not? **Answer:** I can check on that. I know El Centro opted out of this company with the vacant lot ordinance. *(Soto)*

CM Nava asked how many vehicles are being noticed on a monthly basis? **Answer:** Now, there's few: maybe 4 or so a month. Originally 126 cars were removed in 4 months. On those I don't know how many protests we got. We made arrangements for slowing down the removal process for those who requested it. Of those 10-15, all were very cooperative with the City. They just wanted to know what the options were. We stopped the notification process as soon as they contacted staff. We asked them if they wanted an appeal or if it was reasonable to delay the process at staff level. We let them know that we can live with them just working on it, we made that arrangement. *(Soto)*

CM Kelley asked why would it cost more to decrease what their preview was? **Answer:** Because we would have to bear the cost. I don't believe we can use the funds from DMV unless we are members of the JPA and take action through that. *(Soto)*

CM Kelley said that we also need some kind of understanding that if we tell them to stay away from the alleys and not look over fences. **Answer:** Yes we need to explore that, we just haven't had time to fully explore. *(Soto)*

CM Couchman stated that he believes that they also make money off of this, they are paid and they make a certain amount of money on this. They tend to be aggressive because the more aggressive that they are the more money they make so that's part of my concern.

CM Nava stated that he concurred with **CM Couchman**.

Mayor Campbell said that he doesn't think we should get out of JPIA, but we need to look at the ordinance and meet with them and see if we can tweak the thing a little bit. Especially as far as removing cars that are in a back yard that's secure and that's not creating nuisances.

CA Morita mentioned that his memory of the ordinance was that there is an appeal process and that originally the appeal would be to this joint board. But then most of the agencies didn't like that. So I thought the ordinance, if there was an appeal, would come to this body. Now of course we should have a definition that if it creates a problem we should clean that up in a way that if someone does appeal would have a basis in the ordinance to stop or grant the appeal or not.

CM Couchman stated he also feels like if you are paying to do something they are going to do it like I tell them to do it or else I'm not going to deal with them. That's pretty much my bottom line on it. They're going to do it the way I'm going to pay them to do it because I'm the customer. I figure I can write a contract with them and they'll do it the way I tell them to do it.

BO Soto said he understands that but I just don't know how the DMV funds are disbursed. I don't know whether a portion of it is available to the City independently or if they are available only as part of the group.

CM Nava mentioned that part of the reason you are part of the JPIA is the economy of scale.

CM Couchman stated he understands that and it makes a lot of sense but as a City we don't want to enforce one part of that. I really don't see the issue. Maybe there is with the JPA but we don't have the answer yet so there's not much we can do until we find out.

BO Soto said the public hearing and appeal does come to this body and actually goes to the planning director or his designee. At this point we haven't had any appeals. We have had a lot of people come in at staff level and we just work with them. On the 3-day-notice, physical or personal contact is attempted. If no one is home then a 3-day-notice is hung on the car, which is what happened on this case.

CM Nava mentioned to consider that there are few notices per month at this time. I know you mentioned that there were 126 per month at one point so it seems like the process is working.

BO Soto stated that would say that the problem is much, much less now than when we first started this program. Now may be a matter of just maintenance and fine tuning the ordinance per your direction. We will be glad to give you an answer about what the effect would be as far as the economics is concerned.

Mayor Campbell said he would like you to meet with them and see if we can fine tune the ordinance and see what the impact will be.

BO Soto mentioned that he felt that your direction is that you want to explore exempting cars over 25 years or older that are not visible from the street or an adjacent property. Let's say public right-of-way or adjoining property whether they're within an existing building or not.

CM Nava stated that he doesn't know it is hard for me to decide that because considering that there are so few vehicles being noticed now. The other thing is it seems like the process is working like it is supposed to. So I am not actually sure if there's any need to make any adjustments at this point. I understand the concern from the alleyways, but I'm not sure if it's necessary at this point. It sounds like there are very few exceptions. This is one of a handful of cases where they had an issue because the letter wasn't delivered or they weren't notice correctly or maybe they were but didn't respond to the notice.

BO Soto said the notices went out and we have copies of those. We also have copies from the post office where they asked them to pick them up in July.

CM Nava asked how many times has this happened where they haven't replied to any notice? **Answer:** As far as I know there have been 4 times that has happened. The people contact the City Clerk at that point and we meet with them and hold off on processing the removal of the car. We always have been able to come to some kind of an arrangement. In this case after the 3 original notices were given, the 3 day notice was hung on a Thursday and we didn't work on the Friday. Obviously the vehicle owner was quite upset about no one answering the phone call. The car was going to be taken before he could talk to staff but in fact it didn't happen in the 3 days. There's always a lag on time as when it was brought up at council which was 5 days after the notice. We called fire insurances and said they will have to research this. (**Soto**)

CM Miranda asked are we talking about the case on the ten hundred block of K Street? **Answer:** Yes, 1099 K Street. (**Soto**)

CM Miranda stated that particular case was because I didn't know if you saw the vehicles. They are oldies and classics I believe it's a '54 Chevy and a '63 Sedan that are covered and in the back. Those are the typical situations that I was concerned about. Because, if I'm not mistaken we were told that they weren't going to take action on those.

BO Soto said that he didn't recall that and but I do remember that question being asked. I recall the answer being said that if you had an inoperable or unregistered car within an enclosed building.

CM Miranda mentioned that is correct. I have notes but don't have them here in front of me. It was approximately 14 months ago when this happened. **Answer:** I understand that. (**Soto**)

CM Miranda stated that it was clearly said that we were not going to get into it whether yes or no.

BO Soto said he agreed but I'm here to report that the ordinance does not have that exemption.

CM Miranda mentioned that his concern is when people ask me how come we are so pushy on this issue but yet you go to the water plant and you have about 6-8 abandoned beat-up vehicles right in the public view. Does that law apply to our vehicles? I ask you to be sincere. I did go pass by and did see quite a few vehicles there.

Mayor Campbell said I think what we need to do is put a number to it. If there's a vehicle in the person's backyard that is not visible from the street and the car is not creating a nuisance, then the car shouldn't be taken.

BO Soto stated that our report to you is merely to report what happened on the particular case that was discussed during those council member reports. We are asking you for direction from the majority of the council of what you want to do. Staff will do and change the ordinance to what you want if you want to fine tune it.

BO Soto asked for clarification before it goes to vote? **Answer:** In the alley behind chain link fence. (**Kelley**) I understand that but what I'm asking is if you want us to ask JPIA whether cars that are 25 years or older can be exempt? **Answer:** No (**Kelley**)

BO Soto said okay just cars that are inoperable, unregistered and that are not viewable from the street or an adjoining neighbor.

CM Kelley something that they don't need a 10 foot ladder to take a view of.

CM Moore asked for clarification, it's only what is not visible that is what you're looking to massage? **Answer:** Yes (**Kelley**) Everyone is fine with regards to age of vehicles that are still deemed problematic? (**Moore**) **Answer:** Yes (**Miranda & Kelley**)

BO Soto said not visible from an adjoined property or adjoining street.

CM Couchman said the definition of invisible troubles me a little bit here it's visible or invisible. I mean if they cover it with a tarp after it's in their backyard and people cannot see it, is that going to be considered visible or not visible? That's the question that I think we need to have to arrive at. How far do we want to go with it or do we want to go with it at all? What is our definition? What steps can they take to make it not a problem anymore? So that's what we need to look at. We need to talk to JPA and see if we can make changes, period, to that end; then move forward; make the changes at that point in time.

BO Soto said we can ask JPIA these items that were discussed. How far could we go and not affect anything or can we make our own changes and not be affected by it?

The council ***motioned*** to speak with the JPIA in regards to what alterations will be accepted.
m/s/c Kelley/Nava 5-0

AYES:	Campbell, Couchman, Kelley, Miranda, Nava
NAYES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

BO Soto said one more item to discuss is 246 "G" Street it was a home fire that we had not too long ago received a work order from the Police Department saying that they had transient activity in the home. The work order was dated September 21st, by September 26th we had gone out there and inspected the site and taken pictures. We had tracked down two (2) banks that referred us to a field asset service. We contacted the field asset service and got their verbal approval to go check the property and secure it. 2 days later it went on fire.

CM Miranda asked if that is the second house on the corner of "J" and 3rd? **Answer:** No, this was 246 "G" Street in the middle of the block.

b. NATIONAL BEEF UPDATE – YAZMIN ARELLANO, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR

Staff Report and Power Point Presentation – Yazmin Arellano, Public Works Director

CM Couchman asked if the levels had dropped sufficiently from what we had in the past. Is that correct? **Answer:** Yes (**Arellano**)

CM Kelley asked if since the letter of understanding they have been in compliance with those ratios and as of October 1st where do we stand? **Answer:** That's what it seems like; we haven't gotten results after September 22nd because it takes a few days for us to get the results. The in-house results show 12-24 on ammonia, the BOD and TSS they have been complying. (**Arellano**)

c. FIRE STATION NO. 2 UPDATE – YAZMIN ARELLANO, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR

Staff Report – Yazmin Arellano, Public Works Director and Chuck Peraza, Fire Marshal

What we have left is the interior of the building we have airwave communication connecting to all our emergency calls which the City IT is working with our network system. We are in the process of completing the plan check for alarm system which is for the monitoring of our sprinkler system, smoke alarms and heat detectors all Jade Security needs to do now is finalize with Duggins Construction. On the operating procedures we are working on daily operations, dividing equipment what engines will be going out of their response routes, etc. We don't want to leave station uncovered for multiple calls. And on the staffing options we are working on how we are going to split our crews, daily shifts and what criteria we're going to have for call-paid; plus any issues with coverage on vacation or sick leave everything is working out smoothly.

CM Nava said he had spoken to Chief Contreras and he said he's keeping his office on Main and that you **Chuck** already selected your office at the new site.

FM Peraza said he gave me that option and I jumped right on it.

CM Kelley asked where is the end of the fiber optic run for internet connectivity in relation to the Fire Station and how far are they going to have to go to get to it? **Answer:** That will be a question for **IT James Arthur** but there is fiber at the Del Rio facility at the intersection of South Eastern

and “T” Streets and he is looking at other options such as wireless but still working on it. (*Arellano*)

FM Peraza stated that *James Arthur* has a big job to do but is working on that. There are all these options that we’re exploring and we’re going to go with the most cost effective.

CM Nava quoted that there are partnership possibilities too as there are nearby businesses that may need that.

d. SCHEDULED WATER & SEWER RATE INCREASES – RUBY WALLA, FINANCE DIRECTOR AND ROSA RAMIREZ, ASSISTANT FINANCE DIRECTOR.

Staff Report – Rosa Ramirez, Assistant Finance Director

This is an update on scheduled water & sewer rate increases, these increases were adopted back in 2008-2009 after the City followed the Prop. 218 Process. The residential rates are affected on consumption from October 15th thru November 15th and customers will not see this until their December billing. Sewer Rates have been implemented since October 1st billing and that was a 15% increase.

CM Miranda asked if residents had been notified? *Answer:* I believe so when it was adopted back in 2008-2009 and with the Prop 218 process those were the procedures that were followed. (*Ramirez*)

CM Kelley asked if this was the third year? *Answer:* Yes (*Ramirez*)

CM Moore stated that she just wanted to let the Council and members of the audience know that *Rosa Ramirez* is serving as Acting Finance Director and I would also like to let you know we have a new addition to the family in the City of Brawley as Ruby Walla; Finance Director had her baby yesterday.

e. FIRE PREVENTION WEEK – FRANK CONTRERAS, FIRE CHIEF AND CHUCK PERAZA, FIRE MARSHAL

FM Peraza stated that he wanted to invite everyone to the Brawley Fire Department for their 7th Annual Open House on October 15th from 10-2pm. We will have hot dogs and snow-cones and activities.

CM Kelley asked if it was posted on the website? *Answer:* No but will do tomorrow. (*Peraza*)

Mayor Campbell said two (2) firefighters were added to the wall in Sacramento I believe last week.

FC Contreras confirmed that it was *Lt. James Rose* and *Captain Mark Franks* who were added to the California Firefighters Memorial Wall in Sacramento.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

The consent agenda was *approved* as followed: m/s/c Campbell/Nava 5-0

AYES: Campbell, Couchman, Kelley, Miranda, Nava
NAYES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

- a. *Approval* of City Council Minutes of September 6, 2011.
- b. *Approval* of Accounts Payable Registers: September 23, 2011.
- c. *Approve* selection of various Consultants for Professional On-Call Engineering Services.

4. REGULAR BUSINESS

- a. **APPROVE PARTICIPATION IN ICTC CONSOLIDATED DIAL A RIDE SOQ/RFP PROCESS AND AUTHORIZATION OF THE CITY MANAGER OR HER DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE ALL DOCUMENTS IN RELATION TO THIS PROGRAM.**

Staff Report – Yazmin Arellano, Public Works Director

Since 1985 Sunrise Driving Services has operated the Dial A Ride services in Brawley. These services are provided to the general public within city limits. The funding to run this program has gradually decreased over the years. Passenger fares have been increased to offset the program's operational expenses which continue to escalate. In an effort to maximize financially constrained services, the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) will prepare to publish a consolidated Request for Statements of Qualifications and Proposals (SOQ/RFP) to available Dial a Ride service providers for the cities, of Brawley, Calexico, El Centro and Imperial. Prospective bidders will be required to meet standards for receipt of State and Federal grants.

It is staff's recommendation that the City of Brawley participates in the consolidated Dial A Ride SOQ/RFP process to determine if economies of scale can be achieved through a combined bid process. Please note that participation in this process does not commit the City beyond the SOQ/RFP phase.

CM Miranda asked if our local provider been notified about this? **Answer:** Yes, we've been meeting. (**Arellano**)

Mayor Campbell said let's take a look at the process and see what the outcome is.

PWD Arellano stated that basically it runs by our service

CM Kelley asked who provides service to Dial A Ride? **Answer:** Sunrise Driving Services. (Arellano)

Isabel Pacheco of Sunrise Driving Services said it is a relief to her that this was on the agenda.

The council ***motioned*** to approve participation in ICTC Consolidated Dial A Ride SOQ/RFP Process and Authorization of the City Manager or her designee to execute all documents in relation to this program. m/s/c Kelley/Nava 5-0

AYES: Campbell, Couchman, Kelley, Miranda, Nava
NAYES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

b. OCTOBER 4, 2011; STAFFING SUMMARY REPORT – SHIRLEY BONILLAS

Staff Report - Shirley Bonillas, Personnel & Risk Management

In the Public Works Department at the Wastewater Treatment Plant a Wastewater Treatment Operator III has been chosen and we will need a motion to approve to hire this individual. If approved this opens another position at the Wastewater Treatment Plant for a Wastewater Treatment WTP Operator II. The Parks & Recreation Department has three (3) part-time temporary for Cattle Call.

The council ***motioned*** to hire Wastewater Treatment Operator III. m/s/c Kelley/Couchman 5-0

AYES: Campbell, Couchman, Kelley, Miranda, Nava
NAYES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

c. 1ST READING OF ORDINANCE NO. 2011-06: ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BRAWLEY, CALIFORNIA, REPEALING AND REENACTING CHAPTER 6 RELATING TO BUILDING REGULATIONS.

Staff Report – Chuck Peraza, Fire Marshal

These changes are needed as laws have changed and this includes sprinklers.

CM Couchman said that at the Cal-Works building in El Centro he was very concerned during the earthquake as it broke the sprinkler system and destroyed the building and it took a long time to go back into the building.

The council ***motioned*** to approve the 1st Reading of Ordinance No. 2011-06: Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Brawley, California, Repealing and Reenacting Chapter 6 Relating to Building Regulations. m/s/c Miranda/Kelley 5-0

AYES: Campbell, Couchman, Kelley, Miranda, Nava
NAYES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

5. RECONVENE TO COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

- a. **ADOPT PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 2011-03: RESOLUTION OF THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF BRAWLEY, CALIFORNIA APPROVING AND ADOPTING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO ENFORCEABLE OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE PURSUANT TO SECTION 34169 (G) OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT LAW.**

Staff Report - Rosa Ramirez, Assistant Finance Director

That the Brawley Community Redevelopment Agency adopt this resolution and authorize and direct the Executive Director, or designee, to: i) notify the County Auditor-Controller, the State Controller and the State Department of Finance concerning the resolution, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Community Redevelopment Law; and ii) take such other actions and execute such other documents as are necessary to effectuate the intent of the resolution and to implement the enforceable obligation payment schedule on behalf of the agency..

The council ***motioned*** to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 2011-03: RESOLUTION OF THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF BRAWLEY, CALIFORNIA APPROVING AND ADOPTING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO ENFORCEABLE OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE PURSUANT TO SECTION 34169 (G) OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT LAW. m/s/c Campbell/Couchman 5-0

AYES: Campbell, Couchman, Kelley, Miranda, Nava
NAYES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

6. RECONVENE TO CITY COUNCIL

7. COUNCILMEMBERS REPORTS

- a. ***CM Couchman*** announced that Ray Castillo, County Supervisor is out due to a heart attack; I attended the Simbol Mining Grand Opening, the Chamber Mixer at the Hidalgo Hall and got a tour of the landfill.
- b. ***CM Miranda*** said he also attended the Simbol Mining Grand Opening and the Chamber Mixer which was very nice and introduced the new City Manager at this event.

- c. **CM Kelley** stated that he attended the Imperial Chamber of Commerce Mixer.
- d. **CM Nava** mentioned that he also attended the mixer at the Hidalgo Hall , the Simbol Mining Grand Opening and the Film Commission had a shoot here outside of Brawley for Nissan that brought in about \$125,000 in economic impact.
- e. **Mayor Campbell** said he attended the Grand Opening for Simbol Mining and that it was a very good event that included the help of the EZ to get that done, I also attended the Chamber Mixer at the Hidalgo Hall. I would also like to thank staff and City Manager for all their hard work.

8. CITY MANAGER REPORT

- a. **CM Moore** stated she had the opportunity to attend the Coachella Valley ICTC meeting.
- b. Myself and the Department Heads are working on presenting a Contingency Plan in case the Utility User Tax is not passed at the next meeting.
- c. Just a reminder that the Utility Users Committee meets at the Brawley Chamber on Mondays @ 6:00 PM.

9. ADJOURNED TO CLOSED SESSION

REPORT OF ACTION FROM CLOSED SESSION, IF ANY, BY CITY ATTORNEY.

None to report

ADJOURNMENT @ 7:40 PM

Alma Benavides, City Clerk